

**CROSSROADS REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA
PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE
(FINAL) MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2002**

The members of the Crossroads Project Area Committee (PAC) held their meeting at the University Community Medical Center (formerly; Villa View Community Hospital) in the Cafeteria at 5550 University Avenue, from 6:33 p.m. to 8:45 p.m.

The following members were present at Roll Call: Kevin Carter, Anthony Frankhauser, Alison Grant-Carlos, Barbara Hutchinson, Laura Riebau, Jody Talbott, Michael Trunzo, Christine Van Spronsen, Jennifer Wieder Gamez, Mason Younan *and David Nelson*

The following member arrived after Roll Call: David Parsons

The following members were not present: Shukri Adam-Fara, and Abdi Mohamoud
Redevelopment Division Staff or Consultants in attendance: Kathy Rosenow, Lane MacKenzie, Tracy Reed, Luis Ojeda, and Michele St Bernard

CALL TO ORDER: Called to order at approximately 6:33 p.m. by Michael Trunzo.

1. ROLL CALL: Quorum was established when 12 of the 15 PAC members were present.
PAC member David Parsons (13th) arrives (6:40 p.m).

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: for September 26, 2002.

Mike: Does the board want to discuss having Non-Agenda Comments at the end of the agenda rather than at the beginning? Non-agenda comments could be time certain, say 8:10: p.m.?

Laura: Can't the public comment on every agenda item? Yes.

David N: I haven't seen a problem with it being at the beginning.

Motion – Laura/Christine: To continue with the Non-Agenda Comments at the beginning of the meeting agenda; passes (13-0).

Motion – Jennifer/Laura; approve September 26th agenda; passes (13-0).

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: PAC members were mailed the revised July 25th minutes and draft August 22nd minutes.

Motion – Laura/Barbara: Approve the revised July 25th minutes; passes (13-0).

Motion – David P/Christine: Approve the draft August 22nd minutes; passes (12-0-1).

4. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

David P: (synopsis). Regarding Laura's letter. I work for the City of Imperial Beach. The IB redevelopment project does have eminent domain, but it didn't include eminent domain when it was expanded to include the entire city. The original project area has eminent domain and included commercial property. The commercial property didn't turnover therefore, the project area was expanded because of a lack of revenue. Residential areas were included for revenue.

Laura: (synopsis). One of my letters discussed the need for receiving balanced information. Shouldn't we be hearing the pros and cons? Response from the city is that isn't their job. I think we should form a sub-committee to look at the pros and cons of redevelopment. Our community is being improved by the private sector, free enterprise.

David N: I received several notices.

Harry: Who will be deciding blight?

Barbara: I have studied CEQA. Have all PAC members read everything? My issue is property rights and taking of someone's property. I am against eminent domain. Barbara read response letter from redevelopment division.

Motion – Laura/Barbara: to form a sub-committee to look at the pros and cons of redevelopment; fails (3-5-4/1).

4. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Marianna Moran: (synopsis) Did not receive enough advanced notice regarding PAC meeting. Didn't receive notice for meeting until 3 days ago. Will provide the staff with the correct address.

Ursula Freeman: (synopsis) Reads letter. I would like to propose for the agenda of the next PAC meeting a discussion of the removal of all of the 54th Street properties north of El Cajon Blvd. This is a multi-family development area. The area has seven duplexes and seven apartment buildings with 4 to 60 units. What improvements are you looking for? Traffic, schools! More density will create more traffic. What about the pit?

Mike: Jennifer would be deleted from the PAC. What about closing 54th to traffic?

PAC Consensus: Lets wait until later.

Jim Leighton: (synopsis) I am the chair of the *Eastern Area Community Planning Committee*. Laura's letters are her own opinion. The *Eastern Area Community Planning Committee* approved moving forward with the preliminary plan.

Tom Salvestrini: (synopsis) I am a laundry owner in Barrio Logan. I would like to share my redevelopment experience with the PAC. The PAC needs to understand the implications of redevelopment. I am not for or against redevelopment. Businesses in the project area should not be put out of business.

Natalia Morehead: (synopsis) It isn't only property rights. We are wasting taxpayer's money. We aren't using this money to fix the streets. The law has gone bad. What about the separation of church and state?

5. OLD BUSINESS:

Review of revised Crossroads By-Laws

Motion – David N/David P: Accept revised by-laws and approve; passes (13-0).

Goals, Objectives, Projects and Programs

Motion – David P/Allison: Move to Old Business; passed (13-0).

6. NEW BUSINESS:

\$ Distributed: PAC board members received copies of the California Community Redevelopment Law (CRL); Draft of Preliminary Report; Draft of Redevelopment Plan; and Adopted Rules and Regulations for Implementation of Relocation Assistance.

\$ Owner Participation Guidelines (OP Rules)

o **Relocation Process** (Rules & Regulations for Implementation of Relocation Assistance)

Presentation by: **Kathy Rosenow and Lane MacKenzie.**

Note: A discussion follows the presentation. The following comments and answers are synopsis of the discussion.

Christine: Did you say that relocation expenses are exempt from income tax? Is that state and federal income taxes?

Lane: Yes.

Kathy Evan: I am on the City Heights board. Are the housing replacements within or outside the project area?

Lane: The replacement housing could be inside or outside the project area.

Barbara: Aren't court cases expensive?

Lane: About 99% of the property owners agree with the appraised value.

Harry: What about conditional use permits and licenses?

Lane: Agency makes every attempt to help the property or business owner relocate with those current CUP's and licenses.

Laura: What about merging project area? What about replacement housing and expenditure bonds?

Kathy: The merging of a project requires an amendment to the project. They have to go through the entire adoption process. Non-housing must be used within the project area. Replacement of affordable housing can take place within or outside the project area.

David N: If affordable housing is located outside the project area isn't there some requirement to show that it benefit the project area?

Tracy: Yes

David N: Many business owners are not able to or have the ability to participate. This really affects small businesses (e.g. ma and pa businesses).

David P: Several existing businesses within the College Community (e.g. S.D. State) project area recently responded to a request for proposal. The College Community project area was adopted about 1991 and didn't experience new development until a year or two ago.

Motion – David P/Laura: to extend the meeting 15 minutes; passes (12-0-1)

David P: At first glance the draft Crossroads owner participation guidelines are friendlier than the adopted College Community owner participation guidelines.

Kathy: The property owner and tenant will receive a notice.

Lane: Agency will contact the property owner and tenants.

David N: The short timeframe for the response is overwhelming for property and business owners.

Laura: What is the timeframe?

Someone: It is 30-days

Someone: What about increasing the frequency of the PAC meetings?

Tracy: We will look at available dates and locations.

Motion – Barbara/Christine: Discuss additional meetings for November and December at the next PAC meeting; passes (12-0). [Someone left the PAC meeting]

Someone: How does a business or property owner discover they are in a redevelopment area?

Kathy: After a redevelopment project area is adopted it is recorded on the title for all of the properties with the project area. This recordation will have no affect on other project areas.

7. NEXT MEETING DATES AND PRELIMINARY AGENDA ITEMS:

\$ Discuss additional PAC meetings for November and December.

\$ Discuss 54th Street properties north of El Cajon.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion – David P/Laura: Adjourn meeting; passes (12-0) @ 8:40 p.m.

Prepared: 10/10/02

Revised: 10/28/02

Draft approved on: 10/24/02
Motion was by: David N/Laura

With Revisions approved on: 10/24/02
PAC vote was: 11-0-0